

Ms. Tracy Billington
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Re: November 16, 2007 Proposition 50 Round 2 Step 2 IRWM
Implementation Grant Program Call Back List Applicants
Reviews, and Public Comments Meeting.

Dear Ms. Billington:

Though at this point I don't see Ventura County area applicants proposals in the aforementioned round, I am non-the-less writing because I have lingering concerns relative to the Proposition 50 Round 1 IRWM Implementation Grant Program funding awarded to the Watershed Coalition of Ventura County, most especially the \$1.50 million for the City of Simi Valley/Waterworks District No. 8's Tapo Canyon Water Treatment Plant project that must be addressed in the DWR and State Water Board staff discussions with the Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant Program applicants.

Ms. Billington, according to the City of Simi Valley City Council/Waterworks District No. 8 Board of Directors June 11, 2007 staff report(Page 1; Agenda Item 4D), for the City to receive the DWR Proposition 50 awarded grant, it was required to adopt a groundwater plan in accordance with California Water Code Section 10750 et. seq.(AB 3030). The groundwater management plan adopted on June 11, 2007 by the Simi Valley City Council/WWD No. 8 Board of Directors:

1. did not go through a public review and comment period,
2. the City engaged a business to provide input in the preparation of the groundwater management plan, and 3. the name of the groundwater basin changes--from the Tapo Canyon Groundwater Basin(January 8, 2007 City Council Resolution No. WWD-210) to the Gillibrand Groundwater Basin(June 11, 2007 City Council/Waterworks District No. 8 Board of Directors' Resolution No. WWD-214). Had the 2006 legal notice on the Tapo Canyon Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan specified that the P. W. Gillibrand Company, Inc. was involved, I would have included my opposition to the allocation of funds for the Tapo Canyon Water Treatment Plant project, even after the funds were

approved by the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board when I submitted my comments on requested future Proposition 50 IRWM Grant Program guidelines and applications, and other propositions input.

Ms. Billington, the Groundwater Management Plan for either the Tapo Canyon Groundwater Basin, or the Gillibrand Groundwater Basin should have been released for a public review and comment period since according to the June 11, 2007 City Council/Board of Directors staff report it is stated, on Page 2, that "The Board has the opportunity to adopt the Plan at the conclusion of this public hearing if a majority protest has not been filed."

Ms. Billington, the groundwater management plan should have also been released for a public review and comment period because according to the City Council/Board of Directors June 11, 2007 approved Groundwater Management Plan for the Gillibrand Groundwater Basin--I bought a copy of the document on November 8, 2007, and it was the first time I had seen the Plan--"Information regarding each document will be entered into a computer database and the document filed in the Technical GWMP File. Active GWMP files will be maintained at the District. Immediate access will be limited to District personnel, Gillibrand personnel, their assigned technical consultants and their legal representatives. Entities outside of the above referenced groups can obtain the records with the permission of the District and Gillibrand." (Page 11) No!!! No!!! No!!! What happens to the historical records of the existing Tapo Canyon Water Treatment Plant? What happens to all of the Proposition 50 Grant Program application records?

Ms. Billington, the groundwater management plan should have also been released for a public review and comment period because according to the City Council/Board of Directors June 11, 2007 approved Groundwater Management Plan for the Gillibrand Groundwater Basin "It is the intent of this GWMP to be iterative and flexible, allowing for changes, as necessary, to accommodate advances in technology, changes in the number and/or type of monitoring features, and the frequency that data is collected. Monitoring wells may be added to or subtracted from the monitoring network of the most current GWMP. In the future, 'key wells' may be identified or established to provide the data that would be used as a basis for analysis

and decision-making. Groundwater monitoring frequency may be increased or decreased depending on the need(or lack thereof) for additional data. Either the District or Gillibrand can propose changes to the GWMP, however, incorporation of proposed changes would be implemented by mutual consent of both parties." (Page 5) No!!! No!!! No!!! The public, and WWD No. 8 customers must be part of this process.

Ms. Billington, to date I don't know what percentage of the groundwater in the Gillibrand/Tapo Groundwater Basin(s) is used by the P. W. Gillibrand Company, Inc., and the Ventura County Waterworks District No. 8. No matter what the percentage breakdown is, the point remains that this project because it is receiving State funding should have adhered to the established public participation process. Since the process was not entirely followed, these State Proposition 50 IRWMGP funds should be rescinded by the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board.

Ms. Billington, please, the Proposition 50 IRWM Round 2 grant applicants must be aboveboard with: State agencies, their customers, and, most of all, the public. Otherwise, there must be hefty financial and incarceration penalties for deception and lies. No wonder the County of Ventura, the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, and the City of Simi Valley refuse to respond to my comments on the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan(the Board of Supervisors approved an incomplete and inaccurate document), the Flood Mitigation Plan(the Board of Supervisors/Watershed Protection District Board of Directors approved an incomplete and inaccurate document), and the last 2-3 City fiscal years Preliminary Base Budget. And, FEMA to date has not responded to my submitted comments on the current FEMA/Ventura County/Nolte Preliminary Flood Insurance Study(FIS), and Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps(FIRMs)--documents which are also incomplete and inaccurate.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Teresa Jordan